



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

ogy and had been already sketched by Hardouin. Starting from the theory of the twenty-five years of Roman episcopate of Peter, these theologians concluded that Peter must have been in Rome not later than the year 42 A.D.; on the other hand it was only in the year 44 that Paul went to Jerusalem and there met for the first time Cephas, with whom *junxit dexteram*. This Cephas could not be Peter, who at that time was in Rome. But there is no doubt that the Cephas who five years later in Antioch was rebuked by Paul was the same man that Paul had met in Jerusalem, therefore he cannot be identified with Peter, although about that time Peter returned to Jerusalem, to preside over the council of the year 50.

The Vatican Council of 1870 and the discussions about the infallibility of the Pope gave a new interest to the question. But modern Catholic theologians, realizing how weak is the chronological argument based on legendary data, have abandoned Cephas to his fate, and have gone back to Augustine and the old tradition of the western Fathers. (Palmieri, D., *De Romano Pontifice*, Prati, 1902, pp. 372-73. Mazzella, C., *De Religione et Ecclesia*, Prati, 1905, pp. 692-693. Straub, *De Ecclesia Christi*, i, 135. Innsbruck, 1912.) They accepted the identity of Cephas and Peter, but found in the episode of Antioch a new argument in favor of the infallibility of the Pope: "Huiusmodi facto evidenter se prodit Petri primatus. Quamvis enim Paulus verbis doceret non esse opus iudaizare, Petrus autem solo conversationis exemplo videretur docere esse iudaizandum, hic tamen ceteros ipsumque Barnabam *cogebat*, non tantum alliciebat iudaizare. Unde tanta efficacia exempli taciti Petri, ut praevaleret doctrinae praedicantis Pauli, nisi ex eo quod ab omnibus Petrus potior Paulo habebatur eiusque auctoritas suprema esse in Ecclesia credebatur?" (Palmieri, *op. cit.* p. 374.)

G. LA PIANA

A SYRIAC PARALLEL TO THE GOLDEN RULE

Numerous parallels to the Golden Rule of Matt. 7, 12 and Luke 6, 31 have been found in various writers.¹ Most of these are Jewish or Christian, but some of them are far remote in time and place from

¹ Cf. Wettstein, *Novum Testamentum*, i, pp. 341 f.; A. Resch, in *Texte und Untersuchungen*, x (1897), 3, pp. 80 f.; G. Resch, *ibid.*, xxviii (1905), 3, pp. 132 ff.; Heinrici, *Beiträge zur Geschichte und Erklärung des Neuen Testaments*, iii (1905), pp. 85 ff.; and Proost, *De Bergrede* (1914), pp. 153 f. To the passages cited in these works may be added the following: *Mahabharata*, xii, 259, 20: Quod quispiam non vult sibi ab aliis

Judaism and Christianity. Sometimes the precept is put in the positive form and sometimes in the negative, more frequently in the latter. A Syriac parallel, particularly interesting because it combines the two forms, seems to have been hitherto overlooked. It occurs in the philosophical dialogue entitled *The Book of the Laws of the Countries*, and is as follows: "For there are two commandments set before us, which are meet and right for free-will: one, that we should depart from everything that is evil and we hate to have done to ourselves; and the other, that we should do whatever is good and we love, and are pleased to have it done so also to ourselves."²

The Book of the Laws of the Countries is traditionally ascribed to Bardesanes, but is really the work of one of his disciples, who probably wrote in the early part of the third century after Christ. The author may have read, in Syriac or in Greek, a text of Acts 15, 20 or 29 having the Golden Rule in the negative form after the prohibitions, and combined this with the positive form found in Matt. 7, 12 and Luke 6, 31. Ephrem's commentary on Acts 15, 29 is based on a text similar to that attested by D 25 29 etc., *sah, syr. hl.*, Iren. int., Cyp. Bardesanes may have thought of the positive and negative forms of the Golden Rule as constituting "the perfect law of freedom" mentioned in James 1, 25.

Christian scholars are wont to dwell upon the superiority of the positive form, whilst Jewish writers either prefer the latter³ or regard the two as substantially equivalent. Thus Montefiore has "a feeling that Hillel and Jesus meant pretty much the same thing."⁴ Elbogen thinks that Jesus derived the saying from Hillel through tradition, and he finds no special merit in the positive form of statement.⁵ The truth is that both forms of the precept are based on love to our fellow-men (Lev. 19, 18), which according to Akiba as well as to Jesus is the fundamental principle of conduct. On the negative side love "worketh

fieri ne ipse aliis faciat, quia scit quid odiosum sit. Thales (Diog. Laert. i, 36): Ἐρωτηθεὶς . . . πῶς ἂν ἀριστα καὶ δικαιοτάτα βιώσαιμεν [ἔφη] ἐὰν ἂ τοῖς ἄλλοις ἐπιτιμῶμεν, αὐτοὶ μὴ δρῶμεν. *Ep. Arist.* § 168 (ed. Wendland): Ὁ δὲ νόμος ἡμῶν κελεύει, μήτε λόγῳ μήτε ἔργῳ μηδὲνα κακοποιεῖν. Aphraates, *Demonstratio*, xxiii, 62 (*Patrologia Syriaca*, I, ii, 129, ll. 14 f.): "What you dislike when done to you do not do to your fellow." This is word for word the way in which Hillel is said to have summarized the Law (Sabb. 31a); cf. the Palestinian Targum on Lev. 19, 18; and Akiba in Aboth de R. Nathan, c. 26 (ed. Schechter, Recension B, p. 27).

² Cureton, *Spicilegium Syriacum*, p. 5; *Patrologia Syriaca*, I, ii, 551, ll. 11 ff.

³ Cf. e.g. Hirsch in *The Jewish Encyclopedia*, vi, p. 22.

⁴ Montefiore, *The Synoptic Gospels*, ii (1909), p. 550.

⁵ Elbogen, *Die Religionsanschauungen der Pharisäer* (1904), p. 76.

not evil to the neighbour," and hence it is the "fulfilment of the Law."⁶ On the positive side, as in Jesus' parable of the Good Samaritan, love manifests itself in generosity and helpfulness to others. The negative form of the commandment teaches men to be just, whereas the positive bids them to be generous.⁷ The difference between justice and generosity is well expressed by Wettstein: "Iustus est, qui reddit quod debet, quodque etiam ab invito per iudicem extorqueri poterat: bonus sive beneficus, qui liberaliter dat, quod non debet."⁸

WILLIAM H. P. HATCH

THE EPISCOPAL THEOLOGICAL SCHOOL
CAMBRIDGE, MASS.

"STRAIN OUT A GNAT AND ADORN A CAMEL"

In the late Professor Camden Cobern's useful book entitled *The New Archaeological Discoveries and their Bearing upon the New Testament* a section is devoted to Tatian's Harmony of the Gospels, and on pages 205-207 a list of its remarkable readings is given, according to the Arabic text published by Ciasca. The list is misleading, for many of the supposed examples of variation from the standard text are not such in reality. Hamlyn Hill's English translation, on which Cobern relied, is not always correct, and the Arabic translator himself was sometimes unfortunate in his rendering of an ambiguous Syriac word or phrase.

The singular reading quoted above, however, which is one of those given in the list, is not to be laid to the charge of Professor Cobern or of either translator, but is due to an extraordinary combination of two transcriptional or typographical errors, which so far as I am aware has not been observed by any one. Ciasca's Latin rendering of Matt. 23, 24 (p. 71) has indeed "*camelum ornantes*." His Arabic text of the passage (p. 153) has the word *yazdarūna*, which means neither 'they adorn' nor anything else which could possibly be used here. It is at once plain that the true reading was *yazradūna*, 'they swallow.' (I see that Rendel Harris, cited in Hill's translation, had noted this, and doubtless other scholars have made the observation.) Ciasca, however, must have read the word correctly, for his '*ornantes*'

⁶ Rom. 13, 10.

⁷ So also Bruce in *The Expositor's Greek Testament*, 7th ed., i, p. 132.

⁸ Wettstein, *op. cit.*, ii, p. 46.